



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/036,591 | 11/07/2001 | Ran J. Flam | sparta01.005 | 4352 |

25247 7590 11/08/2005

GORDON E NELSON
PATENT ATTORNEY, PC
57 CENTRAL ST
PO BOX 782
ROWLEY, MA 01969

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/036,591

Applicant(s)

FLAM, RAN J.

Examiner

Robert M. Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application No. 10/036,591 RCE filed 9/2/2005 to the original application filed 11/7/2001 by Flam. entitled "Graphical User Interface for Automated Process".
2. The Office withdraws all previous objections/rejections raised, in light of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hirsch et al (US Patent No. 5,586,039, filed Feb. 27, 1995 and issued Dec. 17, 1996, hereafter referred to as "Hirsch") in view of Crater et al (US Patent No. US 6,201,996, filed May 29, 1998 and issued Mar. 13, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Crater").

Regarding independent method claim 1, Hirsch discloses:

A graphical user interface for specifying an action to be performed which modifies a value of a field of a record stored in a memory device, (Fig. 3, Fig. 10) the action, once specified, being thereafter automatically performed (Abstract, Fig. 10 #10d and start event / stop event / frequency) ... , the query being executed on a processor that has access to the memory device, (Fig. 1B and Fig. 10) and interacts with the graphical user interface (Fig. 10) comprising:

a window containing a table wherein the field has an entry that is selectable by the user (Fig. 10 in context of Fig. 3), the entry including a first field that identifies the field to be acted on; (Fig. 10 #10f) and one or more action fields that, when the user has selected the entry, the user may set to specify the action. (Fig. 3 re: action fields)

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*... when a query with which the action-is associated returns the record, ... :
...
... ; and
...*

Crater, though, discloses:

*... when a query with which the action is associated returns the record, (Fig. 4A)
... :
...
... ; and
...*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, Hirsch further discloses:

*the identified field's values belong to one of a plurality of types; (Fig. 4)
and
the action fields in the entry are determined by the type of the identified field's values. (Fig. 3, noting that selection of an "Implant" action determines the type of "Materials" available for performing an implant action)*

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 2,

Hirsch further discloses:

the plurality of types include types whose values belong to ordered sets that are defined in the system in which the graphical user interface is used, (Fig. 3, esp. #3h having action/material/technology ordered sets) types whose values specify times, (Fig. 10, esp. 10g having start/stop/freq times) ...

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

... , and types whose values specify persons.

Crater, though, discloses:

... , and types whose values specify persons. (Fig. 4A, esp. #410)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, Hirsch further discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify that the identified field be cleared. (Fig. 3, esp. #3j)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 1, Hirsch further discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a value and to specify that the value be assigned to the identified field. (Fig. 4, esp. 4g)

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, Hirsch further discloses:

wherein when the field's entry is selected, the user may set the action fields to specify an operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value which is the identified field's value when the record is returned. (Fig. 11, #11L)

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6,

Hirsch further discloses:

wherein the field's value belongs to an ordered set of values; (Fig. 3 in context of Fig. 10 #10d, #10e, #10f) and

...

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

... ; and

the user may set the action fields to specify an increment operation wherein the new value is a value that follows the identified field's current value in the ordered set of values.

Crater, though, discloses:

... ; and

the user may set the action fields to specify an increment operation wherein the new value is a value that follows the identified field's current value in the ordered set of values. (Fig. 4F, esp. "Update rate")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a

process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 1, Hirsch further discloses:

*wherein the identified field may have a null value when the record is returned; (Fig. 4 #4a, #4b, #4c) and
the user may set the action fields to specify an action that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or an action that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value. (Fig. 4 #4g)*

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 1, Hirsch further discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a reference field which is another field in the record and a reference field operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value of the reference field which is the value that the reference field has when the record is returned. (Fig. 15 in context of Fig. 14)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, Hirsch further discloses:

*wherein the identified field may have a null value when the record is returned; (Fig. 8 #8d) and
the user may set the action fields to specify a first reference field and a first reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or a second reference field and a second reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value. (Fig. 8 "Actions")*

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 9, Hirsch further discloses:

wherein the reference field operation assigns the current value of the reference field to the identified field. (Fig. 9, esp. #9e)

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 9, Hirsch further discloses:

*wherein the identified field and the reference field have time values; (Fig. 10, esp. Start Event / Stop Event / Freq.) and
the user may further set the action fields to specify an amount of time by which the reference field's current value is increased or decreased to compute the new value for the identified field. (Fig. 10, esp. Freq.)*

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 12, Hirsch further discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify the amount of time in one of a plurality of ways. (Fig. 10, esp. Start Event / Stop Event / Freq.)

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 13, Hirsch further discloses:

*wherein one of the plurality of ways is days; (Fig. 10, esp. Freq column, noting that "seconds" time units may be expressed as alternative time units, such as minutes, hours, days, etc.) and
when days have been specified, the user may further set the action fields to specify whether the days will be computed as business days or calendar days. (Fig. 10, esp. Freq column, noting that "seconds" time units may be expressed as alternative time units, such as minutes, hours, days, calendar days, etc.)*

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 12, the limitations of claim 12 have been previously discussed:

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

wherein one of the reference fields is a field whose value is always set to the current time when the query returns the record.

Crater, though, discloses:

wherein one of the reference fields is a field whose value is always set to the current time when the query returns the record. (Fig. 5C, noting the value of $X = 0$ along the X-axis, which is labeled "Seconds Ago" and that $X = 0$ is the current time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously discussed:

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein the identified field has a person value; and
the user may set the action fields to specify a role reference field from which a new person value for the identified field may be obtained, the role reference field referring to an ordered set of person values wherein one of the person values is a last-used person value and the role reference field obtaining the next person value following the last-used person value at the time the record is returned as the new person value for the identified field.*

Crater, though, discloses:

*wherein the identified field has a person value; (Fig. 4A, esp. #410) and
the user may set the action fields to specify a role reference field from which a new person value for the identified field may be obtained, the role reference field referring to an ordered set of person values wherein one of the person values is a last-used person value and the role reference field obtaining the next person value following the last-used person value at the time the record is returned as the new person value for the identified field. (Fig. 4A, noting that the available name fields are displayed in #415)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously discussed:

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify a person reference field that has a person value, the identified field being set from the value of the person reference field when the record is returned.

Crater, though, discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify a person reference field that has a person value, the identified field being set from the value of the person reference field when the record is returned. (Fig. 4A, esp. #415)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously discussed:

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein another action has been specified which assigns the person reference field a value from a role reference field; and
when the record is returned, actions which assign person fields values from role reference fields are performed prior to other actions.*

Crater, though, discloses:

*wherein another action has been specified which assigns the person reference field a value from a role reference field; (Fig. 4A, esp. #405, #410 and #415) and
when the record is returned, actions which assign person fields values from role reference fields are performed prior to other actions. (Fig. 4B)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously discussed:

Hirsch, however, does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to directly specify a person value, the identified field being set from the directly-specified person value when the record is returned.

Crater, though, discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to directly specify a person value, the identified field being set from the directly-specified person value when the record is returned. (Fig. 4A, esp. #405, #410 and #415)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Crater for the benefit of Hirsch, because to do so would have allowed a process control interface designer to facilitate selection and performance of actions in a database and remotely display instructions, as taught by Crater in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., GUI-based industrial process control.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/2/2005 (via RCE) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant's amendments to the claims significantly changes the scope of the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments concerning the previous rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 USC 103(a) have been rendered moot.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patents

| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| Du et al | 6,041,306 |
| Jerome et al | 6,323,882 |
| Mahmood et al | 6,341,242 |
| Ridolfo | 6,421,405 |

| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| DiRienzo | 6,338,093 |
| Nix | 6,535,231 |
| Du | 6,052,684 |
| Bjornson | 6,505,145 |
| Calder | 6,737,966 |
| Chaar et al | 5,960,404 |
| Mueller et al | 5,222,211 |
| Chivaluri | 5,872,931 |
| Andersen | 5,999,941 |

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: November 12, 2005

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/17/2005